

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on April 29, 2005.

No claims are amended, canceled, or added. As a result, claims 1-30 are now pending in this application.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant's remarks concerning the claims will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 12-16, 21, and 23-25
Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)
As Being Unpatentable over Tanaka in View of Maier

Claims 1-5, 12-16, 21, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (U.S. 5,437,339) in view of Maier et al. (U.S. 4,213,301).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA, 1974). MPEP §2143.

Tanaka discloses an air-pressure-operated nail gun having a cylinder 1 (FIG. 1) and a sub-cylinder 6. A piston 2 is movable within cylinder 1. Piston 2 has a physically integral driver 3 that is movable within nose assembly 4 to drive a nail. A weight piston 7 is movable within sub-cylinder 6. Weight piston 7 is in contact with a compression spring 8. When air is introduced into cylinder 1 and sub-cylinder 6 via an air supply inlet 9, piston 2 moves downward, and weight piston 7 moves upward. The upward reactive force generated by piston 2 moving downward is described as being offset by a downward force F2 on the shoulder 1' of sub-cylinder 6, causing the nail gun housing to be pushed against the work piece into which the nail is being driven (see column 5, line 46 through column 6, line 5).

Maier discloses an apparatus for driving fastening elements (see Abstract). The apparatus includes a double-headed piston 13 (FIG. 2, described in col. 5, lines 51-58) and a drive piston 5 (see col. 5, line 8) having a shaft 5b to contact a fastening element 15 (FIG. 3).

Neither Tanaka nor Maier, whether considered individually or in combination, discloses all of the claim limitations present in independent claims 1, 12, and 23.

For example, regarding independent claims 1 and 12, neither Tanaka nor Maier discloses a propulsion element (claim 1) or an air delivery infrastructure (claim 12) to propel the piston against the pin [emphasis added]. In Applicant's subject matter, the piston physically strikes the pin. Applicant could not find this disclosed in either reference.

Regarding independent claim 23, neither Tanaka nor Maier discloses an air delivery infrastructure to propel the primary hammer against a secondary hammer [emphasis added]. In Applicant's subject matter, the primary hammer physically strikes the secondary hammer. Applicant could not find this disclosed in either reference.

The asserted combination of Tanaka in view of Maier fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations present in independent claims 1, 12, and 23, so a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

For these reasons, independent claims 1, 12, and 23 should be found to be allowable over Tanaka and Maier, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 12, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Maier be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5, 13-16, 21, and 24-25, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 11, and 33, and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above.

Rejection of Claims 11, 22, and 30
Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Unpatentable
over Tanaka in View of Maier and Further in View of Lindsay

Claims 11, 22, and 30 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Maier et al. and further in view of Lindsay (U.S. 6,095,256).

Tanaka and Maier were discussed above.

Lindsay discloses a hand-held pneumatic impact/engraving tool having a foot-operated control valve 88 (FIG. 17). The control valve 88 includes a barbed connector 114 to which a delivery line 38 to the tool 26 (FIG. 1) is coupled, and the control valve 88 further includes a barbed connector 116 to which a distribution line 32 (FIG. 1) from a pressure regulator assembly 20 may be connected.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA, 1974). MPEP §2143.

The asserted combination of Tanaka in view of Maier and Lindsay fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations present in independent claims 1, 12, and 23, so a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Regarding independent claim 1, none of the three references discloses a propulsion element coupled to the body to propel the piston against the pin [emphasis added].

Further regarding independent claim 12, none of the three references discloses an air delivery infrastructure to propel the piston against the pin [emphasis added].

Regarding independent claim 23, none of the three references discloses an air delivery infrastructure to propel the primary hammer against a secondary hammer [emphasis added].

For these reasons, independent claims 1, 12, and 23 should be found to be allowable over Tanaka in view of Maier and Lindsay.

Claims 11, 22, and 30, which depend from independent claims 1, 12, and 23, respectively, and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11, 22, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Maier and Lindsay be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 6-10, 17-20, and 26-29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but they were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of Applicant's preceding remarks concerning the asserted patentability of independent claims 1, 12, and 23, Applicant does not wish to rewrite claims 6-10, 17-20, and 26-29 in independent form at this time, but Applicant respectfully reserves the right to do so at a later time.

Additional Elements and Limitations

Applicant considers additional elements and limitations of claims 1-30 to further distinguish over the cited references, and Applicant reserves the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Walter W. Nielsen (located in Phoenix, Arizona) at (602) 298-8920, or the below-signed attorney (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ALTON W. HEZELTINE

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9587

By

Timothy B. Clise
Reg. No. 40,957

Date

29 Aug '05

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 29TH day of August, 2005.

Name

John D. Gruber-Worthall

Signature

John D. Gruber-Worthall